Trimerized ground state of the spin-1 Heisenberg antiferromagnet on the kagome lattice

Hitesh J. Changlani[1,2,3] and Andreas M. Läuchli[3]

[1]*Department of Physics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801, USA*
[2]*Institute for Quantum Optics and Quantum Information of the Austrian Academy of Sciences, A-6020 Innsbruck, Austria*
[3]*Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Innsbruck, A-6020 Innsbruck, Austria*

(Dated: January 29, 2016)

We study the phase diagram of the spin-1 quantum bilinear-biquadratic antiferromagnet on the kagome lattice, using exact diagonalization (ED) and the density matrix renormalization group (DMRG) algorithm. The SU(3)-symmetric point of this model Hamiltonian is a spontaneously trimerized state whose qualitative nature persists even at the Heisenberg point, a finding that contrasts previous proposals. We report the ground state energy per site of the Heisenberg model to be $-1.410(2)$ and establish the presence of a spin gap.

arXiv:1406.4767v2 [cond-mat.str-el] 28 Jan 2016

Introduction— The discovery of experimental realizations of kagome antiferromagnets [1, 2] and indications that they have exotic ground states has spurred immense activity in the last few years. The nature of the ground state is unresolved for even the simplest realistic model, the nearest neighbor spin-1/2 kagome Heisenberg antiferromagnet (KHAF) [3–10]. However, recent advances in numerical algorithms have enhanced our understanding of these systems [10–15]

In contrast to the spin $S = 1/2$ case, little has been definitively established for the ground state of the $S > 1/2$ case. When S is large, as is the case for the $S = 5/2$ compound $KFe_3(OH)_6(SO_4)_2$ [16], long-range magnetic order of the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ type is expected [17, 18]. However, for the intermediate spin case, $S = 1$ [19–21] and $S = 3/2$ [22], the theoretical situation is unclear. There exist several experimental motivations [23] for studying this problem. For example, $KV_3Ge_2O_9$ [24] and $BaNi_3(OH)_2(VO_4)_2$ [25] are candidates for $S = 1$, and the chromium-jarosite ($KCr_3(OH)_6(SO_4)_2$) has been reported to be a $S = 3/2$ kagome antiferromagnet [26].

The focus of this Rapid Communication is the $S = 1$ case, with emphasis on the KHAF. Previous numerical studies of the $S = 1$ XXZ model with on-site anisotropy [27, 28] have shed light on the phase diagram, but the approach is limited for the KHAF. Recent coupled cluster calculations [21] show that the $S = 1$ KHAF has no long-range magnetic order, in contrast to previous analytic results [20]. Thus, the definitive characterization of the ground state remains an open question.

Based on exact diagonalization (ED) of the $S = 1$ KHAF, Hida proposed that the ground state is a Hexagonal Singlet Solid (HSS) with a spin gap [19]. The HSS is a translationally invariant state that is described by an Affleck-Kennedy-Lieb-Tasaki (AKLT) [29] type wavefunction. As is schematically depicted in Fig. 1(b), all the spin-1's fractionalize into two spin-1/2's and then the spin-1/2's on every hexagon form a singlet state. However, a recent experiment [30] with m-MPYNN-BF_4, believed to be a $S = 1$ KHAF, has observed magnetization plateaus different from those predicted by the HSS phase [31], calling for a review of this picture.

In this Rapid Communication, we use ED and the density matrix renormalization group (DMRG) algorithm [32] for cylindrical geometries [33]. We show that even though the HSS has a competitive energy (≈ -1.36 per site) in comparison to the DMRG results (≈ -1.41 per site), the qualitative picture obtained from the latter is that of a trimerized ground state, schematically illustrated in Fig. 1(a). This state, referred to as the simplex-solid [34] or simplex-valence bond crystal, is a symmetry broken state where the three spin-1's living on each up (or equivalently down) pointing triangles form collective singlets or "trimers".

We find no long-range spin-spin correlations and a finite spin gap of $\sim 0.2 - 0.3$, for the choice of lattice geometries studied. In addition, the energy of a recently proposed ground state candidate Z_2 spin liquid, the Resonating AKLT state (RAL) [35], is found to be higher than both the HSS and the trimerized state found in DMRG.

We have considered the phase diagram of the nearest neighbor bilinear-biquadratic model,

$$\mathcal{H} = J_{bl} \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j + J_{bq} \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} (\mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j)^2 \qquad (1)$$

where $\langle ij \rangle$ refer to nearest neighbor pairs, J_{bl} is the bilinear Heisenberg coupling (set to $J_{bl} = 1$), and J_{bq} is the biquadratic coupling. While a previous tensor network study showed the ground state to be a simplex solid at the SU(3) symmetric point ($J_{bl} = J_{bq}$) [36], here we provide evidence that this trimerization survives on reducing the magnitude of J_{bq} all the way to zero. A quantum phase transition to a ferroquadruolar spin nematic is observed only at $J_{bq} \sim -0.16$.

The Heisenberg point— We consider $J_{bq} = 0$, the Heisenberg point, and assess the quality of the HSS wavefunction with respect to ED calculations. Following Hida [19], we associate two spin-1/2 degrees of freedom with every spin-1, and define,

$$|+1\rangle \equiv \frac{\psi_{1/2,1/2}}{\sqrt{2}} \quad |0\rangle \equiv \psi_{1/2,-1/2} \quad |-1\rangle \equiv \frac{\psi_{-1/2,-1/2}}{\sqrt{2}} \qquad (2)$$

where $\psi_{\alpha,\beta} \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\psi_\alpha \psi_\beta + \psi_\beta \psi_\alpha)$ and where α,β correspond to spin-1/2 degrees of freedom and have value $\pm 1/2$. Then the HSS wavefunction is defined to be,

$$\phi_{\text{HSS}} = \otimes \psi_{\alpha_i,\beta_i} \prod_i (\delta_{\alpha,\gamma_i} + \delta_{\beta,\gamma_i}) \prod_p w^{\gamma_{i_p},\gamma_{j_p},k_p,l_p,m_p,n_p} \qquad (3)$$



Figure 1. (Color online) (a) shows a schematic of the simplex solid on the kagome lattice. The bond thicknesses represent the relative magnitude of the bond energy. (b) shows a schematic of the Hexagon Singlet Solid (HSS). Each spin-1 (depicted in blue) fractionalizes into two spin-1/2 (shown by red circles). The spin-1/2's on the hexagons form a singlet, shown by the black lines connecting them. (c) shows the cylindrical geometry used in the DMRG calculation. Periodic boundary conditions in the width direction have not been shown.

where p is a label used to distinguish the hexagons and i_p through n_p refer to the sites on the elementary hexagon (in contiguous order) and γ_{i_p} through γ_{n_p} correspond to the spin-1/2 degrees on those sites. $w^{\gamma_{i_p},\gamma_{j_p},\gamma_{k_p},\gamma_{l_p},\gamma_{m_p},\gamma_{n_p}}$ is the coefficient of the lowest energy singlet state of a $S = 1/2$ Heisenberg model on a hexagon.

Table I shows the energy of the HSS, the RAL [35] and ground state wavefunctions from ED for various finite clusters with periodic boundary conditions (the geometries and nomenclature are the same as Ref. [19]). We estimate the HSS energy in the thermodynamic limit to be ≈ -1.36 per site [37]. This is comparable to the exact energy of ≈ -1.4, and much lower than the RAL energy, suggesting that the HSS is a competitive candidate for the ground state.

However, a clear picture of the ground state emerges only for larger systems, which were studied with DMRG. Cylinders with periodic boundaries in the short (width) direction and open boundaries in the long (length) direction, as shown in Fig. 1(c), were chosen for the simulations and finite size analyses. In order to have complete hexagons, even widths were chosen.

Wavefunction	12	15	18 a	18 b	∞
HSS	-1.38781	-1.36024	-1.36108	-1.36995	$\approx$ -1.36
RAL [35]	-	-	-	-1.38	-1.2696
ED	-1.46841	-1.44958	-1.45110	-1.43926	$\approx$ -1.4

Table I. Energy per site for the Hexagon Singlet State (HSS), Resonating AKLT state (RAL) and exact diagonalization (ED) wavefunctions on various kagome clusters with periodic boundary conditions.

The number of renormalized states (denoted by m) kept in the DMRG simulations, were typically 2000, 3000 and 4000 for widths 4, 6 and 8 respectively. On cylinders with widths 4 and 6, and odd lengths (these have equal numbers of up and down pointing triangles), a pattern of alternating strong and weak trimers propagates from both the left and right edges. These competing patterns superpose in the center of the finite sample, leading to uniform bond energies (the bond energy being defined as $\langle \mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j \rangle$ for i, j being nearest neighbor sites). On the even-length cylinders (with more down triangles than up), the left-most row of boundary sites form dimers, effectively decoupling them from the bulk of the system. Thus, the even-length cylinders have similar bulk properties to the odd-length cylinders.

For width 8 cylinders, the tendency to form dimers along the width direction is suppressed and a robust trimerization pattern is observed throughout the bulk. For the odd lengths, DMRG tends to break the symmetry between the up and down pointing triangles, which we take to be evidence that the system prefers to trimerize. This is a "finite m" effect, as an *exact* calculation should yield a perfect superposition of both trimer states.

To estimate the energy per bond in the thermodynamic limit, we used two different procedures. First, we consider the energy E of the entire sample comprising of N_b bonds, and fit it to the functional form,

$$E(L, W)/N_b(L, W) = E_0 + a_1/L + a_2/L^2 \qquad (4)$$

where $N_b(L, W)$ is the number of bonds and e_b,a_1,a_2 are fit parameters. In the second method, we average the bond energies on a central feature, such as the bowtie or "star" consisting of three up and three down triangles. We refer to this estimate as the "bulk" energy. Figure 2(a) shows the length dependence of the energy and its extrapolation to infinite length for different cylinder widths. Both analyses yield similar estimates; for the width 4, 6 and 8 cylinders the values of the energy per bond are $-0.7117(1)$, $-0.7067(1)$ and $-0.7058(4)$ respectively. Assuming small variations for energy estimates beyond $W > 8$, the energy per bond in the thermodynamic limit is $-0.705(1)$, which in terms of the energy per site is $-1.410(2)$. This is comparable to (and slightly lower than) extrapolated coupled cluster results [21]



Figure 2. (Color online): (a) The total ground state energy per bond for cylinders of odd lengths and different widths is extrapolated to infinite length by fitting to the functional form, Eq. (4). The bulk energy (see text) is also shown. (b) shows the spin gap for various cylinder widths and lengths. The estimated gap in the infinite length limit is finite.

($E_0 = -1.4031$) [38].

Next, we verified the presence of a spin gap in the thermodynamic limit, by calculating the energy difference between the singlet and triplet states for both even and odd length cylinders. Our results are shown in Fig. 2(b). The magnetization of the first excited state is distributed over the entire sample, establishing that the excitation is a bulk one. The large variation in the energy gap for the width 4 and the other larger cylinders is a finite size effect; this qualitative difference is also seen in ground state energy estimates. The trends for width 6 and 8 indicate that the spin gap is in the range $0.2 - 0.3$.

To build further confidence in these results, we study the bilinear-biquadratic (BLBQ) model (1) and use J_{bq} as a knob to connect the Heisenberg point to the SU(3) point. Analyzing other Hamiltonians should lead to similar conclusions. For example, an extended-range Heisenberg model, studied by Cai et al. [39], also has a trimerized ground state.

The bilinear-biquadratic (BLBQ) model— For insights into the BLBQ model, we performed ED calculations on a 21 site sample with periodic boundary conditions. Multiple low-energy excited state energies, resolved by spatial momenta, have been plotted in Fig. 3. On tuning J_{bq} from 1 towards 0, we find no energy crossings in the first few states in the low-energy manifold. In the range $-0.2 < J_{bq} < -0.1$, a marked decrease in energy spacings (or increased crowding of energy levels) and the appearance of a small finite size gap, are indicative of a quantum phase transition.

Next, we look for signatures of possible phase transitions as a function of J_{bq} by monitoring the wavefunction fidelity [40], defined as $F \equiv \langle\psi(p)|\psi_{ref}\rangle$, where $|\psi(p)\rangle$ is a wavefunction dependent on parameters p and $|\psi_{ref}\rangle$ is a reference wavefunction. Fig. 4 shows fidelities of the 12 and 21 site clusters (as a function of J_{bq}/J_{bl}) by fixing the reference wavefunction to be the ground state wavefunction of (a) the SU(3) model



Figure 3. (Color online): Low-energy spectrum of the BLBQ model on the 21 site kagome lattice, resolved by lattice momenta, as a function of J_{bq}. On tuning J_{bq} from 1 towards 0, the low-energy features appear adiabatically connected, suggesting the persistence of the trimerized phase to the Heisenberg point. Qualitative changes in the energy spectrum seen at a negative value of J_{bq}, indicate a quantum phase transition to a ferroquadrupolar phase.

(Fig. 4(a)) and (b) the Heisenberg model (Fig. 4(b)). In either case, the fidelity decreases on going away from the chosen reference point and with increasing lattice size; the latter is expected because overlaps involve the multiplication of an increasing number of factors less than 1. We consider an overlap of 0.45 (for the 21 site lattice) between the Heisenberg and SU(3) symmetric point wavefunctions to be large and view the sharp fall in fidelity in the range $-0.2 < J_{bq} < -0.13$ to be the only sign of a phase transition; we thus infer that the Heisenberg point corresponds to a trimerized ground state.



Figure 4. (Color online): Fidelity (overlap) of ground state wavefunctions for various values of J_{bq} with respect to a reference wavefunction for the 12 and 21 site kagome clusters. The reference wavefunction is chosen to be the ground state of (a) the SU(3) symmetric model known to favor a trimerized (simplex solid) phase and (b) the Heisenberg model whose qualitative nature remains to be established and is the subject of this study. The abrupt change in fidelity is found to occur in both cases around $-0.2 < J_{bq} < -0.13$.



Figure 5. (Color online): The trimerization order parameter (obtained by taking the difference of bond energies of neighboring triangles) as a function of J_{bq} for the 8×8 and 14×8 kagome lattice. The dashed line gives an extrapolated estimate of the $J_{bq}{}^*$ at which the trimerization vanishes. Inset: Derivative of the total energy (per bond) with respect to J_{bq} shows an abrupt change around the same value of $J_{bq}{}^* \approx -0.16$.

The inferences from ED are verified on larger samples using DMRG, by considering a variety of metrics. First, as the inset of Fig. 5 shows, the energy as a function of J_{bq} shows a discontinuity in its derivative at a value $J_{bq} \approx -0.16$. This value coincides with the location of the minimum of the singlet-singlet gap, obtained by taking the energy difference of the lowest $S_z = 0$ states in the DMRG method (not shown in plot). However, the most direct evidence is that of a non-zero trimer order parameter, defined to be

$$\text{Trimerization} \equiv \left| \langle \mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j \rangle_\Delta - \langle \mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j \rangle_\nabla \right| \qquad (5)$$

where $\langle \mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j \rangle_{\Delta(\nabla)}$ is the average spin-spin bond correlator on the up (or down pointing triangle). The trimerization is (relatively) uniform throughout the sample on the width 8 cylinders: this data is used to determine the critical $J_{bq}{}^*$ at which the phase transition occurs. When J_{bq} is close to $J_{bq}{}^*$, the trimerization is small and inhomogenous and the presence of the open boundaries becomes important. This is why we used only the values of trimerization for $J_{bq} \geq 0$ and extrapolated them to $J_{bq} < 0$ in Fig. 5.

Below $J_{bq}/J_{bl} \lesssim -0.16$, a ferroquadrupolar spin nematic is seen, a generic occurence in many $S = 1$ antiferromagnets with negative biquadratic couplings [41]. This state has $\langle \mathbf{S_i} \rangle = 0$ but still breaks the spin rotational symmetry. This is verified by the observation that $\langle S_i^+ S_i^- \rangle \neq \langle (S_i^z)^2 \rangle$ and that $\langle (S_i^z)^2 \rangle$ abruptly changes from $0.66 (= 2/3)$ to ≈ 0.4 at the critical point.

Conclusion— We have performed ED and DMRG calculations on the spin-1 kagome antiferromagnet with bilinear and biquadratic terms. We find evidence for trimerization at the Heisenberg point, which is not consistent with the hexagonal-singlet state (HSS) picture [19], nor with the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ order predicted by $1/S$ methods [20]. We also estimated the location of the phase transition from the trimerized state to the spin-nematic phase to be $J_{bq}{}^* \sim -0.16$.

Recently, Li et al. [35] proposed a spin liquid ground state for the spin-1 KHAF, the resonating AKLT state (RAL), obtained by creating a uniform superposition of all possible "AKLT-loops". On an 18 site lattice, the RAL energy is marginally lower than that of the HSS but in the infinite lattice limit is significantly higher [35]. A plausible reason is that the RAL is dominated by long loops, that are still relatively short on an 18 site lattice. Presumably, if the longest loops are penalized (i.e. a loop tension is added in the wavefunction), the RAL energy could improve significantly. Whether such a modification preserves the spin liquid properties or alternately drives it to a confining phase (such as the trimerized phase) is not known. Since the trimerization strength is small, it will thus be interesting to see if additional interactions at the Heisenberg point stabilize the RAL or HSS (or other exotic) states.

Finally, we comment on the possible experimental consequences of our finding. Since trimerization does not change the magnetic unit cell structure of the kagome lattice, we still expect to see the 1/3 magnetization plateau for the $S = 1$ KHAF (based on the Oshikawa-Yamanaka-Affleck criterion [42]). However, prominent magnetization plateaus seen in the experiment with m-MPYNN-BF_4 (which also has a slight $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ distortion) [30] correspond to 1/2 and 3/4 which is indicative of a magnetic unit cell with 12 atoms. Thus, we intend to understand the effective low-energy Hamiltonian better to resolve this issue.

Acknowledgement— HJC thanks Prof. Christopher Henley

for his guidance and for collaboration on related work. We are grateful to Christopher Henley, Shivam Ghosh, Kedar Damle, Steven White, Tyrel McQueen, Michel Gingras, Bryan Clark, Victor Chua and Gil Young Cho for discussions. We also acknowledge useful correspondence with H.-H. Tu regarding Ref. [35]. This work was supported by the Austrian Ministry of Science BMWF as part of the Konjunkturpaket II of the Research Platform Scientific Computing at the University of Innsbruck. HJC acknowledges support from SciDAC grant DOE FG02-12ER46875. Calculations were also done on the Taub campus cluster at UIUC/NCSA.

[1] J. S. Helton, K. Matan, M. P. Shores, E. A. Nytko, B. M. Bartlett, Y. Yoshida, Y. Takano, A. Suslov, Y. Qiu, J.-H. Chung, D. G. Nocera, and Y. S. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 107204 (Mar 2007), http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.98.107204

[2] Tian-Heng Han, Joel S. Helton, Shaoyan Chu, Daniel G. Nocera, Jose A. Rodriguez-Rivera, Collin Broholm and Young S. Lee, *Nature* 492, 406-410 (2012)

[3] C. Zeng and V. Elser, Phys. Rev. B **42**, 8436 (Nov 1990), http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.42.8436

[4] J. B. Marston and C. Zeng, Journal of Applied Physics **69**, 5962 (1991), http://link.aip.org/link/?JAP/69/5962/1

[5] P. Lecheminant, B. Bernu, C. Lhuillier, L. Pierre, and P. Sindzingre, Phys. Rev. B **56**, 2521 (Aug 1997), http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.56.2521

[6] P. Nikolic and T. Senthil, Phys. Rev. B **68**, 214415 (Dec 2003), http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.68.214415

[7] R. R. P. Singh and D. A. Huse, Phys. Rev. B **76**, 180407 (Nov 2007), http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.76.180407

[8] Y. Ran, M. Hermele, P. A. Lee, and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 117205 (Mar 2007), http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.98.117205

[9] G. Evenbly and G. Vidal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 187203 (May 2010), http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.104.187203

[10] S. Yan, D. A. Huse, and S. R. White, Science **332**, 1173 (2011), http://www.sciencemag.org/content/332/6034/1173.abstract

[11] S. Depenbrock, I. P. McCulloch, and U. Schollwöck, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 067201 (Aug 2012), http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.067201

[12] Hong-Chen Jiang, Zhenghan Wang and Leon Balents, *Nature* Physics 8, 902-905 (2012)

[13] Y. Iqbal, F. Becca, S. Sorella, and D. Poilblanc, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 060405 (Feb 2013), http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.87.060405

[14] B. K. Clark, J. M. Kinder, E. Neuscamman, G. K.-L. Chan, and M. J. Lawler, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 187205 (Nov 2013), http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.111.187205

[15] Bela Bauer, Brendan P. Keller, Michele Dolfi, Simon Trebst, Andreas W. W. Ludwig,arXiv:1303.6963

[16] K. Matan, D. Grohol, D. G. Nocera, T. Yildirim, A. B. Harris, S. H. Lee, S. E. Nagler, and Y. S. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 247201 (Jun 2006), http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.96.247201

[17] D. A. Huse and A. D. Rutenberg, Phys. Rev. B **45**, 7536 (Apr 1992), http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.45.7536

[18] C. L. Henley, Phys. Rev. B **80**, 180401 (Nov 2009), http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.80.180401

[19] K. Hida, Journal of the Physical Society of Japan **69**, 4003 (2000), http://jpsj.ipap.jp/link?JPSJ/69/4003/

[20] C. Xu and J. E. Moore, Phys. Rev. B **76**, 104427 (Sep 2007), http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.76.104427

[21] O. Götze, D. J. J. Farnell, R. F. Bishop, P. H. Y. Li, and J. Richter, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 224428 (Dec 2011), http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.84.224428

[22] A. Läuchli, S. Dommange, B. Normand, and F. Mila, Phys. Rev. B **76**, 144413 (Oct 2007), http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.76.144413

[23] S. K. Pati and C. N. R. Rao, Chem. Commun., 4683(2008), http://dx.doi.org/10.1039/B807207H

[24] S. Hara, H. Sato, and Y. Narumi, Journal of the Physical Society of Japan **81**, 073707 (2012), http://jpsj.ipap.jp/link?JPSJ/81/073707/

[25] D. E. Freedman, R. Chisnell, T. M. McQueen, Y. S. Lee, C. Payen, and D. G. Nocera, Chem. Commun. **48**, 64 (2012), http://dx.doi.org/10.1039/C1CC14731E

[26] K. Okuta, S. Hara, H. Sato, Y. Narumi, and K. Kindo, Journal of the Physical Society of Japan **80**, 063703 (2011), http://jpsj.ipap.jp/link?JPSJ/80/063703/

[27] K. Damle and T. Senthil, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 067202 (Aug 2006), http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.97.067202

[28] S. V. Isakov and Y. B. Kim, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 094408 (Mar 2009), http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.79.094408

[29] I. Affleck, T. Kennedy, E. H. Lieb, and H. Tasaki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59**, 799 (Aug 1987), http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.59.799

[30] T. Matsushita, N. Hamaguchi, K. Shimizu, N. Wada, W. Fujita, K. Awaga, A. Yamaguchi, and H. Ishimoto, Journal of the Physical Society of Japan **79**, 093701 (2010), http://jpsj.ipap.jp/link?JPSJ/79/093701/

[31] K. Hida, Journal of the Physical Society of Japan **70**, 3673 (2001), http://jpsj.ipap.jp/link?JPSJ/70/3673/

[32] S. R. White, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 2863 (1992)

[33] E. M. Stoudenmire and S. R. White, Annual Review of Condensed Matter Physics **3**, 111 (2012), http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev-conmatphys-020911-125018

[34] D. P. Arovas, Phys. Rev. B **77**, 104404 (Mar 2008), http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.77.104404

[35] W. Li, S. Yang, M. Cheng, Z.-X. Liu, and H.-H. Tu, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 174411 (May 2014), http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.89.174411

[36] P. Corboz, K. Penc, F. Mila, and A. M. Läuchli, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 041106 (Jul 2012), http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.86.041106

[37] The energy of the HSS wavefunction is found to be lower than

that reported previously [19]
[38] The reported series expansion estimate of $E_0 = -1.4468$ [19] does not agree with our DMRG result.
[39] Z. Cai, S. Chen, and Y. Wang, Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter **21**, 456009 (2009), http://stacks.iop.org/0953-8984/21/i=45/a=456009
[40] P. Zanardi and N. Paunković, Phys. Rev. E **74**, 031123 (Sep 2006), http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevE.74.031123
[41] K. Penc and A. M. Läuchli, *Introduction to Frustrated Magnetism*, Springer Series in Solid-State Sciences **164**, 331 (2011), http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-10589-0_13
[42] M. Oshikawa, M. Yamanaka, and I. Affleck, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 1984 (Mar 1997), http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.78.1984